

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).  
Each volume contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.  
Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, New York.  
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).  
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXVIII, No. 13

MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1935

WHOLE NO. 757

## SOME AMERICAN ESTIMATES OF HORACE<sup>1</sup>

In the view of many scholars American literature and American criticism bear the stigma of subservience to the literary productions of their transatlantic brethren. The remark made a century ago by an English critic, "Who reads an American book?", adequately expresses the sentiment of such readers. The way in which this and similar remarks rankled in the breast of an Emerson, a Poe, or a Whipple implies a modicum of foundation for the satirical query. The existence in America in the middle of the last century of an insistent demand for literary as well as political independence—a sort of literary Monroe Doctrine—is evidence that American literature was in fact leaning heavily upon Europe. This demand arose in response to the resentment against the autocratic rule of the Edinburgh Review, Blackwood's Magazine, and contemporary English criticism in general. The American revolt was also a reaction against the false classicism which the eighteenth century in England left as a heritage to its successor. Unfortunately, however, a confusion of ideas has seemingly arisen in the minds of persons who have given thought to American literature. They have apparently assumed that the American secession from contemporary European literary criticism included a rebellion against *all* the heritage of Europe. They have not distinguished between the neo-classical schools of thought and the classical authors who were misrepresented to authorize the errors of neo-classicism. For this reason, probably, the majority of students of American literature, by discussing any and all possible sources of their authors' ideas save the classical source, give one the impression that the classical influence upon American authors was negligible. A recent study of Poe's literary criticism<sup>2a</sup> finds him indebted to almost any authority save Aristotle and Horace. This is inexplicable, unless the writer cherished the unpleasant thought that whatever a man reads of the Classics in College flies, to borrow a phrase of Swift's, straightway out of his nostrils. Poe's numerous references to Horace are surely too important to be dismissed without mention; and his cavalier remarks about Aristotle require some study. One of the few works on American literature to consider seriously the importance for American literature of classical criticism is Dr. Norman Foerster's

American Criticism<sup>2</sup>, a most valuable work for the classicist in that it evaluates in some detail the contribution made by Aristotle to Poe and Lowell. Of Horace's *Ars Poetica*, however, it strangely takes no account. This deficiency in a book otherwise of such excellence it has been my attempt in various articles<sup>3</sup> to offset. The present paper is concerned, not with the actual use made of Horace by American authors, but with the estimates of Horace expressed by certain American writers.

The American authors considered in this paper are Emerson, Poe, Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes, Stedman, and Huneke. The list is representative rather than exhaustive. The authors were selected on the basis of their importance in the development of American literature during the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth. Possibly other writers of lesser rank, such as Eugene Field and Louis Untermeyer, betray more obviously their indebtedness to Horace. It is a fair question, however, whether the opinions of second-rate authors are either important in themselves or influential to any extent upon the literature produced in their times<sup>4</sup>. Be that as it may, in this paper I have made the selection with two assumptions in mind, first, that what the men selected had to say is valuable in itself, and, secondly, that it forms a document important in the evaluation of the forces formative in American literature.

Three of these seven authors, Emerson, Holmes, and Lowell, were graduates of Harvard University (College). Longfellow was an undergraduate at Bowdoin, but his life is inextricably knit up with Harvard. Stedman spent about two years at Yale, while Poe was for part of a year at the University of Virginia. Huneke, the sole member of the group who did not attend College, made up this deficiency by omnivorous yet systematic reading<sup>5</sup>. Longfellow, Stedman, and Poe took honors in Latin while they were undergraduates. It is also worthy of note that the influence of these seven

<sup>2</sup>Norman Foerster, *American Criticism* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1928).

<sup>3</sup>See Lowell's Debt to Horace's *Ars Poetica*, *American Literature* 3 (1931), 259-276; The Horatian Influence upon Longfellow, *American Literature* 4 (1932), 22-38; Horace and Edgar Allan Poe, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 26 (1933), 129-133; Horace and the Autocrat, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 25 (1932), 217-223; Stedman and Horatian Criticism, *American Literature* 5 (1933), 166-169; Aristotle's Poetics and Certain American Literary Critics, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 27 (1934), 81-85, 89-93, 97-99.

<sup>4</sup>Compare John Drinkwater, Mr. Charles, King of England (New York, George H. Doran Company, 1926): "... Critical virtuosity has for long been anxious to decide whether an age is most truly reflected in its major or in its minor writers, which, indeed, is for an age and which for all time. The answer is that the best writers best accomplish both ends..."

<sup>5</sup>James Gibbons Huneke, *Steeplejack*, 1.126-128 (New York, Scribner, 1918. Two volumes in one).

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the College Misericordia, Villa St. Teresa, Dallas, Pennsylvania, May 4-5, 1934.

<sup>2a</sup>Margaret Alterton, *Origins of Poe's Critical Theory* (published by the State University of Iowa, without date, but apparently about 1925).

writers covers a century in America's recent literary productivity.

The earliest of the writers to be considered is Ralph Waldo Emerson. One looks in vain for any influence of Horace upon Emerson's literary style. Emerson's disjointed, frequently incoherent, remarks, veritable *disiecta membra*, remind one rather of Seneca. They would have been the despair of Horace. Nevertheless Emerson, at least in his earlier years, relished Horace and made use of him. In the lecture entitled Books<sup>6</sup> he calls Horace "the eye of the Augustan age", an opinion which, if he had arrived at it independently, can be the result only of careful study of the Roman poet. More surely indicative of the esteem in which Emerson held Horace is a remark in the lecture entitled Inspiration<sup>7</sup>:

... I find a mitigation or solace by providing always a good book for my journeys, such as Horace or Martial or Goethe—some book which lifts me quite out of prosaic surroundings, and from which I derive some lasting knowledge . . .

For Emerson to classify Horace with Goethe—we shall find the same collocation made by Longfellow—is for him to do Horace high honor.

Even if Emerson failed to imitate Horace's polished Muse, he evidently appreciated her. In the lecture on Old Age, he remarks<sup>8</sup>, "We have an admirable line, worthy of Horace, ever and anon resounding in our mind's ear, but have searched all probable and improbable books for it in vain". But perhaps Emerson's highest praise of Horace occurs in The Progress of Culture<sup>9</sup>:

The highest flight to which the Muse of Horace ascended was that triplet of lines in which he described the souls which can calmly confront the sublimity of Nature:

Hunc solem, et stellas, et decedentia certis  
Tempora momentis, sunt qui formidine nulla  
Imbuti spectant.

As he grew older, Emerson apparently neglected Horace. In his Journal for 1867, he has entered this memorandum<sup>10</sup>:

... I rarely take down Horace or Martial at home, but when reading in the Athenaeum, or Union Club, if I come upon a quotation from either, I resolve on the instant to read them every day. But—at home again, homely thoughts . . .

While these selected references to Horace do not betray the deep and lasting enthusiasm which Horace often inspires, the marvel is that Emerson paid him any attention at all. Two beings more remote from each other by nature than Emerson and Horace can with difficulty be imagined. Horace's insistence upon form and finish could have sounded no responsive chord in Emerson. Horace's delight in men and in city life is not a sentiment to win a retiring soul. Nor could Horace's occasional indifference and flippancy toward the serious side of life appeal to one who, whatever his fortune,

was not *parcus deorum cultor*<sup>11</sup>, but remained all his life a preacher. One cannot help wondering whether there is something antipathetic to Horace in Transcendentalism. Thoreau, who is close to Emerson in thought, shows no interest in Horace, whereas those writers who are out of sympathy with the Transcendentalists appear to be the more Horatian the less sympathy they have with Emerson. It is no small tribute to the winning power of Horace that he was able to interest even for a time the great American philosopher.

Next to Emerson in time is Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Like Emerson, though he was an equally good borrower, Longfellow comparatively seldom quoted his sources. Nevertheless, one can trace in Longfellow a steady though not large stream of citation from Horace and reference to his writings. Horace was at first simply the most pleasant study which Longfellow had met at Bowdoin. Longfellow refers to Horace as "it" rather than as a person, and the reason for his enjoyment may well lie in his naïve admission that Horace is extremely easy to read<sup>12</sup>. This last admission makes it obvious that Longfellow had probably read the Odes and the Epodes alone, a surmise which is supported also by the nature of the greater number of his quotations from Horace. Fifteen years later, in a letter to a friend who had asked his advice about the proper classical author for study, he wrote<sup>13</sup>:

If I may venture to advise, take Horace—for fifty reasons which you will please to imagine . . . He is my favorite classic, and whenever I quote Latin, which, as you know, is not often, I quote him; because his phrases stick . . .

Like Emerson, Longfellow compares Goethe and Horace<sup>14</sup>, but, whereas Emerson spoke of Horace as on a par with Goethe, Longfellow holds the Roman an artist superior to the German. This liking for Horace is attested by references to him made at intervals throughout Longfellow's life<sup>15</sup>. Shortly before he died, we find him spending parts of his mornings in pleasant readings of Horace with his daughter and a life-long friend<sup>16</sup>. One could also go into detailed study of Longfellow's methods of composition and show that his manner of composition was akin to that advocated and illustrated by Horace<sup>17</sup>.

Emerson and Longfellow, as they themselves admit, are not given to frequent quotation. Their use of Horace and high opinion of him are therefore the more remarkable. An additional reason for their somewhat sparing use of Horace is their aversion to formal criticism, for perhaps Horace's most obvious influence upon literature is through his critical theories as set forth principally in his *Ars Poetica*.

The authors whom I now proceed to discuss, authors who are at the same time critics, show much more frequently the Horatian imprint.

Edgar Allan Poe is almost *sui generis*. He belongs

<sup>6</sup>The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson. With a Biographical Introduction and Notes, by Edward Waldo Emerson, 7.204.—This edition was published at Boston, by the Houghton Mifflin Company, in twelve volumes, at various dates. Volume 7 is dated at first in 1870, in the latest version in 1912. So Volume 8 is dated in 1875 and in 1917.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibidem*, 8.295.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibidem*, 7.329–330. <sup>9</sup>*Ibidem*, 8.225.

<sup>10</sup>Emerson's Journals, Edited by E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes, 10.218 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1909–1914).

<sup>11</sup>Horace, *Carmina* 1.34.1.

<sup>12</sup>Samuel Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, 1.49 (Boston, Ticknor and Company, 1882).

<sup>13</sup>*Ibidem*, 1.320.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibidem*, 1.319.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibidem*, 1.49, 230, 319, 320, 2.130, 174, 187, 193, 197, 205.

<sup>16</sup>Samuel Longfellow, Final Memorials of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, 192 (Boston, Ticknor and Company, 1887. Pp. vi, 447).

<sup>17</sup>See my article, The Horatian Influence upon Longfellow, *American Literature* 4 (1932), 22–38.

to the *genus irritabile* of critics as well as of poets. He is no *laudator temporis acti*, but is rather impatient of all tradition; to use another Horatian phrase, he is *nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri*<sup>18</sup>. Even Coleridge, for whom he professes a feeling as near reverence as his nature can compass, comes in for his share of bludgeonings. Aristotle, whom he mistakenly supposes to have said something with which he disagrees, is dismissed as a man of "singular assurance"<sup>19</sup>. . . . That such a critic as Poe would adopt a swashbuckling attitude toward Horace, the arbiter of eighteenth century criticism, was to be expected. We are therefore the more surprised that Poe not only quotes Horace as authoritative, but at the same time never speaks slightly of him. In an extravaganza called *Bon-Bon*<sup>20</sup> Poe even shows some affection for Horace, addressing him as "dear Quinty". When he wishes to illustrate some of his extravagant notions about scansion, he employs Horatian Odes as illustrations<sup>21</sup>. He can even make an atrocious pun on a verse of the *Satires*<sup>22</sup>.

Poe's knowledge of Horace antedates the publication, and probably the composition, of his earliest poems<sup>23</sup>. Ingram quotes an early friend of Poe to the following effect<sup>24</sup>:

He was very fond of the *Odes* of Horace, and repeated them so often in my hearing that I learned by sound the words of many, before I understood their meaning. In the lilting rhythm of the sapphics and iambics, his ear, as yet untutored in more complicated harmonies, took special delight.

It is uncertain when Poe first studied the *Ars Poetica*. Horace is, however, one of the few critics, ancient or modern, with whom Poe's jealous search for originality permits him to agree. Horace is "our ancient friend Quintus Horatius"<sup>25</sup>; "friend" is a rare epithet for Poe to apply to a critic. If one compares Poe's critical theory with Horace's, his belief in the liking of Poe for Horace's principles is strengthened<sup>26</sup>. The chief themes of his own criticism, care in execution, literary propriety, and organization, Poe found in Horace, and time and again he painstakingly quotes the Horatian passage which supports him.

Even Poe, however, with all his respect for his "ancient friend Quintus Horatius", is not the man to make copious use of any other writer's work. It remained for Oliver Wendell Holmes to become the American counterpart of Horace. The striking similarity between the two has been noted by a number of scholars<sup>27</sup>. Theirs

were similar temperaments. Horace's eclectic philosophy with its Stoic basis and the Unitarian philosophy so earnestly promulgated by Dr. Holmes are remarkably alike. Both writers were felicitous composers of occasional verse. Both loved epigrammatic point without the sarcastic sting. Both were passionately attached to one spot: Horace sings the praises of Rome, Holmes dubs Boston the "hub of the universe". Holmes's remarks about Horace, which are to be found in every literary work he ever published, give a rounded picture of his esteem for Horace. He is "that grand Roman gentleman"<sup>28</sup>, incomparable even among the ancients for wit and wisdom. He is "that Roman gentleman, who said so many wise and charming things with such coninnity as is to be found nowhere else that I know of"<sup>29</sup>. Holmes considers it a fair assumption that a contemporary gentleman will know his Horace and his Vergil well<sup>30</sup>. Horace is the author to calm the pulse that has been roused by Homer<sup>31</sup>. The most enviable man of Holmes's acquaintance is John O. Sargent, who gives his life to the study and the translation of Horace<sup>32</sup>. The more one studies Horace, the more value Horace yields him<sup>33</sup>. In short, Holmes considers Horace his guide, philosopher, and friend, *dimidium animae*<sup>34</sup>.

While Holmes was not a professional critic, he had a good deal to say about criticism. He considers the *Ars Poetica* a splendid piece of criticism, "crowded with lines worn smooth as old sesterces by constant quotation"<sup>35</sup>. Not a little of this attrition is contributed by Holmes himself. Not given to slavish imitation—a fault Horace would have been the first to condemn in literature<sup>36</sup>—, Holmes urges a wise and thorough examination of what Horace has to offer<sup>37</sup>. He wrote thus:

If young poets would only study and take to heart Horace's *Ars Poetica*, . . . it would be a great benefit to them and to the world at large. I would not advise you to follow him too literally, of course, for . . . the changes that have taken place since his time would make some of his precepts useless and some dangerous; but the spirit of them is always constructive.

In 1931, when I was making a detailed study of the Autocrat<sup>38</sup>, I wrote to the Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes, asking him about his father's acquaintance with Horace. He replied that, although he had heard his father say appreciative things of Horace, he feared that his father's acquaintance with Horace had been rather superficial. Thereupon I sent him the manuscript of the article in which I set forth the results of my study of the Autocrat. When he returned it, he wrote<sup>39</sup>, "I

The Independent 67 (1909), 554; Edward Everett Hale, *Memories of a Hundred Years*, The Outlook 72 (1902), 311-312.

<sup>28</sup>J. T. Morse, 2. 311-312 (see note 27, above).

<sup>29</sup>*Ibidem*, 2. 80.

<sup>30</sup>Oliver Wendell Holmes, *A Mortal Antipathy* (The Works of Oliver Wendell Holmes, 7. 156. [Holmes's Collected Works were published by Houghton Mifflin, Boston, in eleven volumes, in 1895]).

<sup>31</sup>Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Elsie Venner* (Works, 5. 279).

<sup>32</sup>Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Over the Teacups* (Works, 4. 157).

<sup>33</sup>*Ibidem* (Works, 4. 158).

<sup>34</sup>*Carmina* 1. 3. 8.

<sup>35</sup>Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Works, 11. 243-244).

<sup>36</sup>*Ars Poetica* 134-135.

<sup>37</sup>Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Over the Teacups* (Works, 4. 89-90).

<sup>38</sup>The Autocrat and Horace. THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 25 (1932), 217-223.

<sup>39</sup>Silas Bent, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, 16 (New York, The Vanguard Press, 1932): "... As the Justice approached ninety he re-read Horace and the Greek classics . . . I have Justice Holmes's consent to publish what I have written in the text above about my correspondence with him.

<sup>18</sup>Epistles 2. 2. 102, *Ars Poetica* 173, Epistles 1. 1. 14.

<sup>19</sup>The Works of Edgar Allan Poe, 3. 411, 4. 392 (New York, W. J. Widdleton, 1867. Four Volumes). Compare Coleridge's *Prose Works*, Edited by William Greenough Thayer Shedd, 3.468-469 (New York, Harper, 1871. Seven volumes).

<sup>20</sup>The Works of Edgar Allan Poe, 2. 491-492.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibidem*, 2. 219-229.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibidem*, 3. 597. The pun is made on *Sermones* 2. 8. 4-5.

<sup>23</sup>Hervey Allen, *Israel: The Life and Times of Edgar Allan Poe*, 1. 99 (New York, George H. Doran Company, 1927. Two volumes), shows that Poe must have made the acquaintance of Horace not later than 1822.

<sup>24</sup>John H. Ingram, *Edgar Allan Poe*, 18 (London, 1886), thus quotes Colonel J. T. L. Preston, a boyhood friend of Poe. This fact was brought to my attention through a note by Emma Katherine Norman, *Poe's Knowledge of Latin*, in *American Literature* 6 (1934), 72-73.

<sup>25</sup>The Works of Edgar Allan Poe, 3. 157.

<sup>26</sup>Horace and Edgar Allan Poe, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 26 (1933), 129-133.

<sup>27</sup>John Torrey Morse, *Life and Letters of Oliver Wendell Holmes*, 1. 230 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1896. Two volumes); W. G. Ballantine, *Oliver Wendell Holmes*, *North American Review* 190 (1909), 185; *An Appreciation of Oliver Wendell Holmes*, Unsigned,



have found it very instructive, because I had no idea that so strong an infusion of Horace was in my father's writing".

James Russell Lowell, esteemed by many our foremost American critic, is also infected with what Dr. Holmes called "Horatio-mania"<sup>39</sup>. "The Roman genius", he wrote, "produced but one original poet, and that was Horace"<sup>40</sup>. Without pausing to discuss this startling opinion, we may note the admiration which it implies. In his essay, *Rousseau and the Sentimentalists*, after differentiating sentiment and sentimentalism, Holmes defines sentiment as "intellectualized emotion precipitated, as it were, in pretty crystals by the fancy". This, he adds, "is the delightful staple of the poets of social life, like Horace and Beranger, or Thackeray"<sup>41</sup>. This description of Horace he elsewhere analyzes: Horace, he says, is characterized by elegance, restraint, and adequacy without excess<sup>42</sup>, his poetry by point, compactness, and urbanity<sup>43</sup>. In his Harvard Anniversary Address, he describes his own attitude toward Horace and at the same time defines his conception of proper classical instruction<sup>44</sup>:

Many a boy has hated, and rightly hated, Homer and Horace the pedagogues and grammarians, who would have loved Homer and Horace the poets, had he been allowed to make their acquaintance . . .

In his criticism, too, Lowell is essentially Horatian. It was "wise Horace" who enunciated the principle *nonum prematur in annum*<sup>45</sup>. He finds that his own ideas are quite in accord with those of Horace. Lowell, in fact, was widely enough read to realize that art is eternal, and that the general principles once expressed by Aristotle and Horace still endure. He writes thus<sup>46</sup>:

The themes of poetry have been pretty much the same from the first; and if a man should ever be born among us with a great imagination, and the gift of the right word—for it is these, and not sublime spaces, that make a poet—he will be original rather in spite of democracy than in consequence of it, and will owe his inspiration quite as much to the accumulations of the Old World as to the promises of the New.

Three of the five writers already discussed were College professors. We now take a bewildering jump from Harvard Yard to the New York Stock Exchange, where our next writer had a seat. Edmund Clarence Stedman, a critic now forgotten, but honored in his own day, was also infected with "Horatio-mania". In his two critical works which were best known, *Victorian Poets*<sup>47</sup> and *Poets of America*<sup>48</sup>, Stedman evinces his high esteem of Horace, an admiration corroborated by his less-known works<sup>49</sup>. "Nowadays", he says with pardonable hyperbole, "we poets and critics have Homer and Horace by heart"<sup>50</sup>. This, be it noted, he wrote

in 1875, when all the writers considered in this paper, save Poe and Huneker, were living and active. His review of Victorian poetry leads him to the conclusion that of all classical authors Horace is the Briton's favorite<sup>51</sup>. Horace is greater than Tennyson, and far superior to Pope<sup>52</sup>. Within his range, Horace is the most enduring poet; his odes will survive *aere perennius*<sup>53</sup>. The characteristic markings of his range are lyrical grace and charm—he can add a grace to the daintiest theme—, feeling, fancy, everything witty, wise, and charming, delightful verse, human character in sunny and wholesome moods<sup>54</sup>. Stedman ranks the Odes of Horace as equal even to the Idyls of Theocritus, than which he can give no higher praise<sup>55</sup>; he spent two years in preparing a text of Theocritus's Idyls in the hope of some day publishing a translation of them—a hope unfulfilled. This lavish praise of Horace's Odes is paralleled by Stedman's use of Horatian principles in his criticism. The matter of the *Ars Poetica* could be reproduced substantially in its entirety from the works of Stedman.

The last writer to be considered is nearly contemporary, James Gibbons Huneker, who died in 1922. Huneker differs from the other writers. He was a reporter and special writer for various newspapers in New York and Philadelphia. Though he was primarily a student of music, his interest embraced all the arts, seeing no barriers between them; he was a Roman Catholic, a nephew of Cardinal Gibbons, and strongly influenced by his admiration for the Jews. Not a College graduate, he supplied the defects of his education by embarking when he was still a youth upon an encyclopedic course of reading of the literature of the world, a feat that required a half-century for its accomplishment<sup>56</sup>. Before he entered upon this massive undertaking, however, he was thoroughly grounded in Latin grammar and had some acquaintance with Latin literature. It is evidence of the staying power of Horace that, when in 1918 Huneker surveyed his life, he could write that, while his Latin grind made him hate Cicero and the rest, "Horace is ever at my elbow . . ."<sup>57</sup> In the same autobiography, he writes again, "The classics, Greek and Latin, are what Bach and Beethoven are to musicians"<sup>58</sup>.

One must bear in mind that Huneker was a writer for the newspapers, without the time to file his work which Longfellow and Lowell enjoyed. Even when he prepared his critical papers for publication in volumes, the results of this hasty writing could not be entirely avoided. Nor would his readers receive the same courtly style of writing which the New England Brahmins enjoyed. Furthermore, he could not, like Poe, interlard his reviews with frequent scraps of Latin, for audiences had changed, and erudition was no longer the fashion. Huneker was, besides, first of all a student of music; his vocabulary and his metaphors were therefore largely

<sup>39</sup>John Torrey Morse, 2. 312 (see note 27, above).

<sup>40</sup>The Complete Works of James Russell Lowell, 2. 199 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1904. Sixteen volumes).

<sup>41</sup>Works, 4. 195-196. <sup>42</sup>Works, 3. 31, note.

<sup>43</sup>Works, 4. 240.

<sup>44</sup>Works, 7. 184.

<sup>45</sup>Works, 12. 195; Horace, *Ars Poetica* 388.

<sup>46</sup>Works, 2. 105.

<sup>47</sup>Victorian Poets (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1875).

<sup>48</sup>Poets of America (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1885).

<sup>49</sup>Nature and Elements of Poetry (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1892); *Genius, and Other Essays* (New York, Moffat, Yard, and Company, 1911); *Life and Letters of Edmund Clarence Stedman*, Edited by Laura Stedman and G. M. Gould (New York, Moffat, Yard, and Company, 1910. Two volumes).

<sup>50</sup>Victorian Poets, 204.

<sup>51</sup>Victorian Poets, 274.

<sup>52</sup>Victorian Poets, 199-200.

<sup>53</sup>Carmina 3. 30-1.

<sup>54</sup>Nature and Elements of Poetry, 93-94; *Genius, and Other Essays*, 147.

<sup>55</sup>Nature and Elements of Poetry, 169. Compare *Life and Letters of Edmund Clarence Stedman*, 1. 384-385 (see note 49, above).

<sup>56</sup>James Gibbons Huneker, *Steeplejack*, 1. 126-128 (see note 5, above).

<sup>57</sup>*Ibidem*, 1. 63.

<sup>58</sup>*Ibidem*, 1. 129.

derived from this favorite pursuit. He was nevertheless a power in the literary world, although never so recognized as were Lowell and Stedman. It is almost surprising that amid the welter of figures induced by his intimate knowledge of painting, sculpture, and music what would seem the comparatively tame figures derived from literature should have any place. It is a fact, however, that the Horatian figures which are most employed by Huneker, the *purpureus pannus* and the *limae labor*<sup>59</sup>, are figures related to the plastic arts.

Huneker mentions Horace more than thirty times, always in support of his own position; he never takes issue with Horace. His criticism, though broad enough to embrace nearly the entire field of art, is seldom at variance with Horace's position, though often he modifies or develops dicta of Horace after the manner indicated by Holmes<sup>60</sup>. One of the best proofs of the enduring quality of Horace is the fact that the most modern and most widely read of American critics is still essentially Horatian.

The first three writers discussed in this paper, Emerson, Longfellow, and Poe, while they were acquainted with Horace and agreed with him often, can scarcely be classed as Horatian in their thinking. Emerson and Poe looked to Horace for corroboration of their own opinions much as a man quotes the Scriptures in support of a position he has already taken. Poe did, however, inform his readers in America with something of the scope of Horace's criticism. Longfellow occasionally quotes Horace as a gentleman and scholar should, and seems to have cherished a growing liking for him. None of these, however, was engaged to follow the words of Horace. Lowell, more widely read than his predecessors, was better able to estimate the value of Horace to the world at large, as poet and more particularly as inspirer of the world's best subsequent criticism. Lowell was, moreover, a lover of Horace the man. But the greatest admirer of Horace in the group, and the nearest approach to him in character, was, obviously, Holmes. Stedman is the lengthened shadow of the man he calls his "beloved friend and master, James Russell Lowell"<sup>61</sup>, and carries on the attitude of Lowell toward Horace an additional quarter-century. Huneker, the modern critic, conversant with recent and contemporary Continental criticism, introduced America to this, to her, new field of thought, where he found enunciated critical beliefs quite in harmony with, or derived from, those expressed by Horace.

The American writer, as exemplified in the last four men considered, has come to look upon Horace as a teacher who, while he is no longer believed infallible, is always suggestive and valuable in his expression of permanent literary laws. Although the American is *nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri*, he is quite ready to follow the philosopher Seneca, who writes of the earlier Stoics, *Permitto mihi et invenire aliquid et mutare et relinquere. Non servio illis, sed adsentior*<sup>62</sup>.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON  
COLLEGE

JOHN PAUL PRITCHARD

<sup>59</sup>Ars Poetica 16, 291.

<sup>60</sup>See the text to which note 37, above, is related.

<sup>61</sup>Life and Letters of Edmund Clarence Stedman, 2, 149 (see note 49, above).

<sup>62</sup>Seneca, Epistulae Morales 47.

## AESCHYLUS THE DRAMATIST

In view of the abundant literature that deals with the Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus there is something arresting in the confession of a scholar of the rank of L. R. Farnell<sup>1</sup> that to him this drama offers an insoluble problem. In the play we have, he says, a "blameless Prometheus", a Zeus who is "cruel" and "ungrateful", whose character as depicted in the play "violently conflicts with the religious message that Aeschylus strives to convey in his other works . . ." On this Professor Farnell remarks (45), "Here then is the paradox, which some scholars try to belittle, but no one has explained".

It may well be that the mind of Aeschylus has not been fully understood. But it is also true that the prime condition of such an understanding is to make the right approach. Repeated reading of Professor Farnell's article has left me dissatisfied with his approach, which is that of one who deals primarily with the religious aspect of the play. Indeed he comes very near to resolving his own difficulty in the following tentative remark (48) concerning Aeschylus, "... We might say that he gives himself up wholly to his dramatic imagination, which comes near to shattering his normal theologic creed". Precisely so. Aeschylus is primarily a dramatist. The elements of the epic story, Prometheus the benefactor and Zeus the tyrant, lend themselves admirably to dramatic treatment, in the sense which Goethe had in mind when he said to Eckermann, "after all, the only point is to get a conflict that admits of no solution . . ." Aeschylus in the Prometheus Bound has so sharpened the conflict that at first thought there seems to be no solution.

However, a solution is foreshadowed. Into the fabric of the Prometheus Bound are woven certain threads that carry on beyond the confines of this single play. In the latest previous discussion of the Prometheus in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY<sup>2</sup> Professor Prentice seems to do less than justice to this fact, in saying (29 A), "This play of Aeschylus is complete in itself. It matters little whether or not it was one of a trilogy treating a single subject . . ." But observe the intimations of a future deliverance, first in 27, then more clearly in 771-774, and then in a varied form in 1027-1029. Again, there is the series of references to the secret, hinted at in 167-171, 518-519, more specifically described in 761-774, and defiantly proclaimed in 907-910.

The plot of the Prometheus Unbound is known in its outline. There is a reconciliation with Zeus, in harmony with the forecast in verses 186-192 of the Prometheus Bound. While there may be lack of agreement about the details of the plot, one may safely grant that Zeus did not "by any act of repentance and atonement restore himself to the moral veneration of the thoughtful worshipper . . ." (Farnell, 48). This probable lack of repentance and atonement on the part of Zeus seems to Mr. Farnell unaccountable. Assuming as he does that Aeschylus meant to depict Zeus as wholly reprobate and Prometheus as "sinless", one may concede a diffi-

<sup>1</sup>L. R. Farnell, The Paradox of the Prometheus Vinculus, The Journal of Hellenic Studies, 53 (1933), 40-50.

<sup>2</sup>William Kelley Prentice, Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.26-29.

culty. But the assumption is not justified, for Zeus is the ruler and represents authority, and Prometheus, with all his philanthropy, is, in the eyes of the chorus, open to the charge of *αἰθαδία*<sup>3</sup>. This *αἰθαδία*, for the purposes of the solution of the problem, is a matter not of the past, but of the present; it consists not in what Prometheus has done for man, contrary to the will of Zeus, but in his present persistent implacability, now that punishment has been visited upon him. In an ordered world, righteous indignation may become a fault if, tenaciously held, it exalts itself above an ordered conduct of affairs. Perfect justice is not attainable. The philosophy of Aeschylus is similar to that wisdom of life that is embodied in the saying current in legal circles that the business of a court is not to do justice but to settle the disputes of men. Prometheus was in error in being persistently implacable. It was 'the error of a noble nature'<sup>4</sup>, as Aristotle might phrase it, but an error. The establishment of an order in the world and a working harmony in human society is paramount, as against the injured feelings of any individual<sup>5</sup>.

That the thought of Aeschylus lay in this general direction is made probable by a comparison of his method in the only instance where a real comparison is possible, in the Oresteian Trilogy. The Agamemnon and the Choephoroi present a problem. The wife murders her husband; the son murders his mother by way of requital and at the command of a god, and then goes mad. Had these two plays only been preserved, the outcome would indeed furnish a puzzle. The solution which Aeschylus offers in the Eumenides lifts the whole controversy above the plane of a personal problem, and above all considerations of justice in the sense of a balancing of accounts. Human society takes a forward step, and a new institution is created, a court that shall henceforth, by an ordered system of law, care for the obligation of blood revenge. The personal problem of Orestes is not solved. It is simply left as insoluble. The solution that is offered is something that concerns human society and human relations. In the case of the Prometheus Unbound, too, the result is clear, for there is a reconciliation. The processes by which the result is reached, if we knew them in all detail, might be as unconvincing as are the disputes of Apollo and the Furies over the guilt of Orestes. We may not, then, so interpret the Prometheus Bound as to make it a paradox. There was a reconciliation in the course of which the personal problem of Prometheus receded into the background, as does the personal problem of Orestes. As to acts of atonement and repentance which might be demanded by the feelings of the ancient spectator, the

exposition in Professor Smyth's Aeschylean Tragedy<sup>6</sup> seems fully adequate to meet that difficulty.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

EDWARD FITCH

### GREEK AND THE TEACHER OF LATIN

If the teacher of Latin is to avail himself of all resources at his command, he must fortify himself for the greatest possible efficiency by acquainting himself with allies who have made brilliant records in well-nigh every department of literary expression—the writers of ancient Greece.

Professor Gilbert Murray has sagely observed<sup>1</sup> that "... the things of life may be grouped under two heads: things that change, and things that do not change, things of permanent value; the Classics belong in the second group. The beauty of great poetry never wanes". Now the value of Greek, like the value of Latin, inheres in its literature. The best teaching either of Greek literature or of Latin literature demands familiarity with the other on the part both of teacher and of student. Erasmus, one of the greatest Latin scholars of his day, vividly pictured the true situation when he said, 'Without Greek literature Latin goes limping on one foot'.

The field of literature is, of course, so vast that it would take a lifetime to explore it fully. All that we can reasonably hope is that in School and College students will be able to acquaint themselves with what is greatest and most needs careful study. The purpose of the teacher of Greek should be to use such opportunity as comes to him in the crowded curriculum of the day to bring to bear upon the minds of students the high ideals, the lofty aims of some of the greatest of the early writers whose works have fortunately been transmitted to us. If he can sharpen the mind of a student with the finest tool that has ever been forged, the Greek language, the most artistic product of the Greek mind and of the Greek spirit, he is rendering that student an inestimable service, whether the student realizes it or not. Greek literature has an unbroken history of thirty centuries, which may be divided into three periods, the first from Homer to Aristotle, the last from the sixth century A.D. to the present time. The key that unlocks this treasure-house is a knowledge of Greek.

As one ponders the situation that exists in America to-day, his thoughts keep recurring to the Greek attitude, the Greek mind, the Greek spirit, the Greek point of view. What most of all distinguished the Greeks—at least the best of them, best intellectually—from all other races before their time or since their day was their power of thought. They gave ascendancy to the intellectual; surrounding nations were under the domination of the material. The Greeks were therefore masters, not servants, in the realm where thought was king. Whereas others were content with the mere effortless average, the best Greeks sought *ἀρετή* in

<sup>3</sup>It is worth while here to read what Professor La Rue Van Hook says, to like purport, in his review of George Thomson, Aeschylus: The Prometheus Bound, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27.53-54. See 54 B, last paragraph, C.K. >.

<sup>4</sup>The expression, "the error of a noble nature", occurs in the work entitled A History of the Literature of Ancient Greece, by K. O. Müller (continued after his death by John William Donaldson), 1.435 (London, John W. Parker and Son [1835]. Three volumes). In writing it the authors had in mind Aristotle's thought in Poetics, Chapter 13.

<sup>5</sup>See Herbert Weir Smyth, Aeschylean Tragedy, Chapter 4, especially pages 116-117 (The University of California Press, 1924). <For a review, by Professor Charles W. Peppier, of this book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19.216-218. Chapter IV of this book (99-122) is devoted to the Prometheus Bound. C.K. >.

<sup>6</sup>See note 5, above.

<sup>1</sup>This passage is to be found in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.215 (May 18, 1912), in a report of an address which Professor Gilbert Murray made at a meeting of the New York Latin Club (now the New York Classical Club).



every sphere. They loved knowledge for its own sake. They were characterized by fearlessness of intellect. They were untrammelled by hierarchies which might have put a damper on free inquiry. They discovered that Nature works by fixed laws, and to these laws, not to blind force, they were ready to yield compliance. They in fact created our intellectual life, supplied the vehicle for the transmission of the Christian religion, gave us a royal start in the vast field of science, started us in the search for model government, and set up the foundations of our modern educational systems and erected much of their superstructure. Above all they made the discovery that the greatest thing in the world was not matter, but personality ( $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ). That is their supreme contribution. It was to the development of that personality in the young men of Athens that Socrates gave his best efforts. The stimulus of his own great personality can be seen, in part at least, in the writings on his successors, Plato and Aristotle.

The qualities of the Greek spirit which I have touched upon only in part are beautifully reflected in writings which extend from the time of Homer over a period of fifteen hundred years. In these writings, for example, in Homer, Thucydides, and Xenophon, there is the rare quality of detachment. It has been well said<sup>2</sup> that Homer writes "with the pen of the Recording Angel, not of the Judge . . ." In the best Greek literature there are always in evidence also directness and simplicity, marks of greatness in style, as in life itself.

An extract from the syndicated writing of President Frank of the University of Wisconsin must have been widely read, since it appeared in many newspapers. It bears the striking title *Socrates and America*. What Mr. Frank wrote was suggested by a remark of R. W. Livingstone to the effect that, if Socrates, resurrected, were to settle in America, the only folk he would visit would be the professors of Greek. Mr. Frank disagreed with Mr. Livingstone, for, in his opinion, the real Greek spirit is not to be found in the professors of Greek!! Mr. Frank was led to imagine what Socrates would say to the professors of Greek. I quote part of the words he ascribed to Socrates:

Since the one hundred per cent Athenians gave me the famous drink of hemlock for my having disturbed their peace of mind by asking questions that exposed the crumbling foundations of their dogmas and prejudices, I have been hobnobbing with the gods and spending my spare moments watching you who are supposed to be the guardians of the Greek spirit in the school rooms of earth.

I have been pained, most learned doctors, to see you put the minutiae of the Greek language above the meaning of the Greek literature. Classicism seems to mean to you an academic discipline. With us it was a way of living and thinking. Aside from the love of beauty and order, the Greek spirit that animated the Greeks whose writings you teach meant a never satisfied hunger of mind that never stopped asking questions until the

<sup>2</sup>To the volume entitled *The Legacy of Greece*, a collection of essays by ten writers (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1921), Mr. R. W. Livingstone, the editor of the volume, contributed the article *Literature* (249-287). On page 274 he asserts that, when Achilles and Agamemnon meet, at the close of Iliad 22, "... we, no doubt, should take Hector's side. But Homer stands apart from the quarrel, and sees both men and the feelings of both, writing with the pen of the Recording Angel, not of the Judge. What he ... thought <about the quarrel> can only be guessed at . . ."

authentic had been separated from the artificial in the opinions of the rank and file of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Frank's natural conclusion is that Socrates would not be popular in America. But, while it *may* be true that in days long gone by the spirit of Greek literature was sacrificed by teachers of Greek, far too much to the letter, to-day the majority of teachers of Greek are fully alive to the ideals of freedom, of beauty, and of truth set forth by the Greeks.

One who will take the time to read an article entitled *Intellectual Life Imperilled*, by Alvin Johnson, in *The American Scholar* 2.312-319 (May, 1933), will be convinced of the necessity of maintaining, in the interest of scholarship, this freedom of thought in the world of literature and science. Greece and England alike won it by sheer moral force. Socrates and Sir Thomas More appraised it above their own personal lives. The home of its birth is Periclean Athens and a little group of Ionian city-states. It finds imperishable expression in the writings of Herodotus and Thucydides, of Plato and Aristotle, and their literary peers. It is the spirit of free inquiry forever enshrined in the immortal words of Aristotle: 'Plato and truth are alike dear to me, but it is a sacred duty to prefer the truth'. Freedom of thought lived again in the world of Goethe and Schiller, and their like. Is it not needed in the education of modern youth to counteract the materialistic trend of the times? Would it not be a step upward if our educational administrators and leaders could see their way clear to encourage a return to the fountainhead of forsaken virtues?

UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

ALFRED W. MILDEN

### SUPPLEMENTARY FODDER FOR CATTLE, MODERN AND ANCIENT

Last year we were constantly reminded in newspapers and agricultural journals of the disastrous effects upon large sections of our country, of the severe drought of 1934. To the normal load of the farmer's woes were added burned pastures, short crops, and the problem of wintering any surviving livestock. This situation brought about, perforce, considerable experimentation with emergency rations for cattle, together with widespread dissemination through the agricultural journals of the results of such experimentation.

One writer<sup>1</sup>, discussing the drought and the prospects for winter feed throughout a large portion of the Middle West, stated that, in their efforts to provide feed for their stock, farmers had added to the harvested remains of the more or less staple crops "a motley mess of odds and ends, such as Russian thistle, wild sunflowers, foxtail grass, various other dry-land and swale grasses, giant ragweeds, straw and combine stubble", a bill of fare which, he said, is "filling, but rather short in vitamins, calories and the stuff that makes hamburgers and sirloins".

<sup>1</sup>Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.6.1.

<sup>2</sup>E. V. Wilcox, in an article entitled *We Went Dry Again*, in the *Country Gentleman*, November, 1934 (this article appeared on pages 13, 35-36). The quotation is to be found on page 35.

On another page (81) of the same issue of the *Country Gentleman* appeared a note<sup>2</sup> entitled Salted Chopped Cornstalks:

Extreme drought conditions have brought about all kinds of ingenuity for making roughage go farther. Even before drastic methods of feed conservation were necessary we found that feeding corn fodder in the barn and, after the cows had eaten off all the leaves, storing the remaining stalks and running them through the silage cutter once a week, was a very satisfactory arrangement when silage did not hold out throughout the winter.

A large lard tub or half barrel for a container answers the purpose, depending on the size of the herd. The chopped stalks are salted, one large handful <of salt> for approximately ten cows, and about ten quarts of water poured over, an amount which will be readily taken up by the chopped material. Allowing this to soak for twelve hours, drain off the salt solution and pour over the material in the container, for that on top will take up water again and the salt will be more evenly distributed. This, fed in the mangers, the grain ration spread on top, will be cleaned up by most cows.

The plan offers a very economical way, we find, of utilizing corn fodder stalks and other waste roughage....

As I read of these emergency measures, I thought of a chapter of Cato<sup>3</sup> on the subject of feeding, a portion (§ 2) of which runs thus<sup>4</sup>:

... Si faenum non erit, frondem iligneam et hedera-ciam dato. Paleas triticeas et hordeaceas, acus fabaginum, <de> vicia vel de lupino, item de ceteris frugibus, omnia condito. Cum stramenta condes, quae herbosissima erunt in tecto condito et sale spargito, deinde ea pro faeno dato. ....

... If you have no hay, feed leaves of the ilex and of ivy. Store away wheat and barley straw, husks of beans, of vetch, of lupines, and of other crops, all of them. In storing litter, put under cover that which contains the most herbage, sprinkle it with salt, then feed it in place of hay....

The age-old practice of harvesting leaves as forage for cattle, sheep, and goats is well known. In this connection Dr. Mary Johnston<sup>5</sup> has called attention recently to the use of elm leaves, mentioning a drought-born modern instance of this kind together with cita-

tions from Cato and Varro. It may be of interest to add a reference or so to another Roman agriculturist, equally expert in the farming methods of his day. Columella<sup>6</sup>, in discussing the kinds of trees suitable for a vineyard, gives highest praise to the elm as a tree well adapted to the vine, providing a most agreeable fodder for cattle, and thriving in a variety of soils. The Gallic or Atinian elm especially, he says, is taller and more thrifty than the native sort; it yields a leaf more agreeable to cattle, in fact so very agreeable that animals fed constantly with this fodder go off their feed when leaves of the other kind are again given to them. The Atinian elm, then, should be planted exclusively, or, if that be impossible, it should be alternated with the native sort to provide a mixture of leaves made more delectable by this quasi-seasoning. The poplar, though best suited to the vine, is rejected by most farmers because, since it yields only scanty foliage, and foliage not proper for cattle, it fails to serve the two purposes desired. The ash, a tree most acceptable to sheep and goats and not unsuited to cattle, is properly planted in rough and hilly places where the elm is less thrifty<sup>7</sup>.

In a chapter<sup>8</sup> devoted to the feeding of cattle Columella sets the time for the use of leaf fodder as July 1 to November 1, when the leaves have become fully ripened by rain or continual dews. Here again are mentioned in order of approval the leaves of the elm, ash, and poplar. The ilex, common oak, and laurel are ranked last, though the use of them is necessary after summer when the supply of other leaf fodder has been exhausted. Fig leaves, too, may be fed, if the supply is plentiful, or if it is expedient to strip the trees. Dry leaves may be fed in winter—twenty *modii* to the feeding if grain is withheld. One *modius* of green laurel or ilex may supplement the grain ration<sup>9</sup>.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

HARRISON BOYD ASH

<sup>2</sup>Res Rustica 5.6.3-5. The best text for eight of the thirteen books of Columella is still that of J. G. Schneider (*Scriptores Rei Rusticae*, Volume 2 [Leipzig, 1794]). A modern critical text of *De Arboribus* and of *Res Rustica*, Books 10, 11, and 1-2, has been provided by Vilhelm Lundström. Of this Fascicles I, VI, VII, II, were published respectively at Upsala in 1897, 1902, 1906, and at Gothenburg in 1917. <I call attention to Professor Ash's dissertation (Pennsylvania University), L. Iuni Moderati Columellae Rei Rusticae Liber Decimus: *De Cultu Hortorum*. Text, Critical Apparatus, Translation, and Commentary (Philadelphia, 1930. Pp. 131).

<sup>3</sup>Compare *De Arboribus* 16.1.

<sup>4</sup>Res Rustica 6.3. See especially §§ 6-7.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibidem*, 6.3.5.

<sup>6</sup>By Warren H. Froelich.

<sup>7</sup>De Agri Cultura 54.

<sup>8</sup>The text is that of George Goetz (Leipzig, Teubner, 1922).

<sup>9</sup>Elm Leaves for Fodder, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 28.23. Professor Knapp appended a note to this article (23, note 4), in which he remarked that, in 1889, in a normal season, he had seen cattle in Vermont eagerly devouring the leaves of trees newly felled.